

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Initially, Applicants would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449, and for acknowledging the acceptability of the Drawings.

However, Applicants note that the Examiner has not yet acknowledged Applicants Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority documents. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge Applicants Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority documents in the next Official Communication.

Upon entry of the above amendments, the Abstract will have been amended and claim 47 will have been added. Claims 1-47 are currently pending, with claims 23-46 being withdrawn from consideration in a previous Official Action. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding objection and rejection, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

***Objection to the Abstract***

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the abstract for being too long. In this regard, Applicants submit that a replacement Abstract having an appropriate length is being submitted concurrently herewith.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection to the Abstract is believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MATSUMOTO (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0140407) in view of HAYASHI (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,912).

In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner asserts, inter alia, that MATSUMOTO discloses a nozzle device comprising a spray hole (near 25), a pipe forming a first flow path 27a that introduces the washing water into the spray hole, and a cover member 20 having the spray hole, provided so as to surround the pipe 27a, and a front end that is closed. Further, the Examiner asserts that MATSUMOTO discloses a space between the pipe and the cover member forming a second flow path 27b that introduces the washing water to the spray hole (see paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Official Action).

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Applicants submit that the presently claimed invention is very different structurally from the device of the applied prior art.

More specifically, Applicants submit that, assuming the piston 20 in MATSUMOTO can reasonably be considered a pipe that forms a first flow path 27a, MATSUMOTO *cannot* possibly disclose a cover member (*also* 20) provided so as to surround the piston 20, and having a front end closed.

Likewise, Applicants submit that, assuming the piston 20 in MATSUMOTO can reasonably be considered a cover member 20, MATSUMOTO *cannot* possibly disclose a pipe (*also* 20) that forms a flow path 27a.

That is, Applicants submit that, regardless of the Examiner's interpretation, MATSUMOTO *cannot* possibly disclose *both* the presently claimed cover member and pipe that forms a flow path 27a. In this regard, Applicants submit that claim 1 sets forth separately a pipe and a cover member. Further, Applicants submit that it is improper for the Examiner to construe, as has apparently been done, element 20 as being both a pipe and a cover member. Therefore, Applicants submit that, since MATSUMOTO *cannot* disclose *both* the cover member and pipe (for reasons discussed supra), MATSUMOTO also *cannot* possibly disclose a space between a pipe and cover member.

Further evidencing the above, Applicants submit that MATSUMOTO *merely* discloses the first 27a and second flow paths 27b being formed as elongated paths *within* the piston 20 (see, paragraph 282 on page 15 of MATSUMOTO).

Thus, for reasons discussed supra, Applicants submit that it is clear that MATSUMOTO does not disclose separately *both* a pipe and cover member, as generally recited in claim 1; much less, a space between the pipe and cover member forming a second flow path, as also recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants submit that newly added claim 47 is fully supported by at least Figure 11 of the present Disclosure. Accordingly, no new matter is believed to be entered by entry of the present Amendment.

In view of the arguments herein, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-22 and 47, Applicants

assert that these claims are allowable on their own merit, as well as because they depend from independent claim 1 which Applicants have shown to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.

SUMMARY

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an indication to that effect. Applicants have argued the allowability of the claims and pointed out deficiencies of the applied references. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Applicants submit that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance and should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between the claims prior to the present amendment and the amended claims. Further, no acquiescence as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection is made by the present amendment. All other amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding the present response or this application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Ji Woong KIM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Bernstein', written over a horizontal line.

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

July 17, 2009  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

**Enoch E. Peavey**  
**Reg. No. 57,686**